

### **REMARKS**

Claims 4-8 and 10-16 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1-3 and 9 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, Claims 4-8 and 10-15 amended, and Claim 16 added. Because support for Claim 16 is provided in the originally filed application, for example paragraph [0089], Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

### **Telephonic Interview**

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Perry and Roy during the telephonic interview conducted on September 19, 2006. The amendments and remarks presented herein are made in view of the points discussed during the interview.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 7-8 and 10-12 were objected to for containing informalities therein. Applicants have amended the claims in a manner believed to be responsive to the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0070663 A1 to Ogura et al. (Ogura). Claims 1 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,294,870 to Tang et al. (Tang). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura as applied to Claims 1, 2 and 4 and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,067 to Kobayashi et al. (Kobayashi). Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura as applied to Claims 1, 2 and 4 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,592 to Matthies.

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the above-cited rejections for the following reasons.

Claim 16 recites an organic electroluminescent display device including a plurality of pixels located above a substrate, each pixel being formed of two light-emitting elements and producing only two different colors of predetermined chromaticity values, wherein each light-emitting element is formed by interposing a luminescent layer containing organic electroluminescent materials between a pair of electrodes, at least one electrode of the pair of electrodes includes a plurality of independent array patterns corresponding to the light-emitting elements, wherein a mixture of the two different colors produces colors falling within a line segment between two different colors by controlling each gradation of the two light-emitting elements in a CIE<sub>xy</sub> chromaticity diagram, wherein a part of the color falling within the line segment produce colors falling within a circular area of a 0.1 radius with a center in a pure white coordinate of 0.31, 0.36 in the CIE<sub>xy</sub> chromaticity diagram, and wherein the two light-emitting elements are driven by different electric currents or voltages to achieve a quasi-color display.

The claimed invention provides a display device that provides a picture in quasi-color (that is, close to being a full color picture), so that it is necessary to ensure that at least one of the pair of the electrodes includes a plurality of independent array patterns that correspond to the light-emitting elements. As illustrated in figure 5, the first display

electrode of the light emitting elements R and B are independently formed so that it is possible to form a multicolor picture by controlling the gradation of each of the R and B light emitting elements independently of (see page 17, lines 24-25 of the specification). In this way, it is possible to display a mixed color between a chromaticity (0.61, 0.39) of R light emitting element and a chromaticity (0.17, 0.30) of B light emitting element (see Table 2 on page 25 of the specification). Accordingly, it becomes possible for a mixture of two different colors to produce colors falling within a line segment between two different colors by controlling each gradation of the two light-emitting elements in the CIE<sub>xy</sub> chromaticity diagram, and it is also possible for a part of the colors falling within the line segment to produce colors falling within a circular area of a 0.1 radius with a center in a pure white coordinate of 0.31, 0.316 in the CIE<sub>xy</sub> chromaticity diagram.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ogura, Tang, Kobayashi and Matthies, alone or in any combination thereof, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 16.

For example, Ogura fails to teach anything about a chromaticity diagram and any control of gradation of light-emitting elements having predetermined chromaticity values. Applicants enclose herein two pictures, wherein one picture was produced by the display device of the claimed invention, and which provides an image very close to a full color picture, and wherein the other picture was produced using a conventional display device (such as the one disclosed by Ogura), and which provides an image that is not a color picture.

Kobayashi discloses a mixture of blue and yellow lights, which produce only a white light that can be used as illumination or backlighting. Clearly, using Kobayashi's common anode (2) and the common cathode (6) fails to control the gradations of blue and yellow light emission elements. As a result, Kobayashi's display device emits a light having only one chromaticity. Further, Kobayashi fails to teach or suggest supplying different currents or voltages to two different light emitting elements. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that it is not possible for Kobayashi's display device to display an image that is close to a color picture.

Tang and Matthies suffer from the same deficiencies as Ogura and Kobayashi.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each and every feature of a rejected claim. For the reasons discussed above, the Ogura and Tang do not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 16.

Furthermore, to establish *prima facie* obviousness, each and every feature recited by a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. For the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogura, Tang, Kobayashi and Matthies, alone or in any combination thereof, does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest that which is recited by Claim 16.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 16 is not anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of Ogura, Tang, Kobayashi and Matthies and should thus be deemed allowable.

Claims 4-8 and 10-15 depend from Claim 16. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 16 is allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.


### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejections, allowance of Claims 4-8 and 10-16, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. **107156-00193**.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Murat Ozgu  
Registration No. 44,275

Enclosures: Exemplary Pictures 1 and 2  
Petition for Extension of time

**Customer No. 004372**

ARENT FOX PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

MO:elp